

Annual Program Report Narrative

Academic year: 2007-08

Department/Program: **HESS/ Physical Education Degree program(s): MS in Physical Education - C & I**

Person(s) preparing report: Gloria Napper-Owen

Date submitted: 10-30-08

1. List the student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the academic year, including those for which data were gathered as well as those for which developmental work was done, such as the creation or piloting of assessment measures.

See attached assessment grid.

2. For each learning outcome, describe a) the measures used (at least one-half of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure must be used for each SLO), b) the sample of students from whom data were collected, c) the timetable for the collection, and d) the setting in which the measures were administered.

See attached assessment grid.

3. Describe the results of the assessment. (What do they tell you about student learning? What did you learn about strengths and weaknesses of your program?) If specific results are not available, describe the progress that has been made on the initiatives included in the approved assessment plan.

Based on student data, it was determined that the indirect measure (comp exam) as established did not provide a strong indication of student performance. Therefore the program has reconsidered the assessment measures and will begin to gather data on demonstration of pedagogical content knowledge through an instructional video analysis associated with PEP 570: Analysis of Teaching.

The curriculum maps developed by students in the PEP 510 course demonstrate good understanding of how to establish appropriate progression of learning that aligns outcomes and instruction and assessment of learning. The supervision project provides evidence of the advanced candidate to mentor teachers in best practices and the development of instructional and managerial skills in the classroom.

These are new assessment measures for this program goal. Previously this goal was measured by the results of the comprehensive exam; the program faculty determined that such an assessment was a poor indicator of the goal. Consequently, these are new measures to be implemented when PEP 516 and 571 are next taught, spring 09 and 10

4. Describe the departmental process by which faculty reviewed the assessment procedures and results and decided on the actions and/or revisions that were indicated by them.

The CARC develops systems to document assessment to ensure consistency in reporting across the COE. Assessment data are entered into the COEAS by program coordinators. This system generates reports by semester and type of assessment. Program coordinators share these data with their program faculty. Program faculty then discuss the results of the assessments and how they inform faculty about their students' learning. Faculty also examine what the results indicate about the effectiveness of the program overall. Finally the faculty consider whether the assessment method does accurately and effectively evaluate SLOs and program goals. Changes in program procedures, instruction, and assessment may result from a discussion of results. Programs report and discuss results of their assessments at Department Meetings. Department Chairs then share the results of assessment at the College level. The CARC meets regularly to examine college-wide assessment procedures. The chair of CARC and the Associate Dean in charge of assessment meet with Departments and programs to help evaluate and develop ongoing assessment systems that are manageable, effective, and meaningful.

5. Describe the actions and/or revisions that were implemented in response to the assessment processes and results.

Based on evaluation criteria for the MS advanced degree program in C & I, the faculty determined that new assessments should be created that directly displayed application of knowledge pertaining to best practices.

The results of the assessment indicate that more direct measures such as these need to be included within other courses for this advanced degree. Students demonstrate their skills and knowledge through appropriate behaviors which transfer to the classroom.

Based on evaluation of student performance, new measures were set in place to provide a direct measure of use of content and pedagogical content knowledge.

- 6. Given the assessment activities and results to date, describe your assessment plans for the next year (2008-09). If significant changes have been made to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy, please clearly describe. (Remember that half of all assessment measures must be direct measures of student learning (see link in #2 above).)**

Based on evaluation of student performance, new measures were set in place to provide a direct measure of use of content and pedagogical content knowledge.

NCA Assessment Grid: MS Physical Education – Curriculum and Instruction

| Program Goal | Student Learning Objective | COE/ Univ. Goal | Assessment/**PIP/ Course if applicable | Direct/ Indirect | Score Range | Pass Score |
|--|--|--------------------|--|---------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Advanced physical education teacher candidates come to understand disciplinary content knowledge, the application of that knowledge to the teaching of physical education, and modes of inquiry that form the basis for physical education programs and instruction. | The physical education masters student demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge to make disciplinary knowledge/content understandable to learners. | *U, P/ K, S | Instructional Video Analysis/ PIP 2/ PEP 570 | Direct | 1-4 | ≥3 |
| | | | Comprehensive exam or thesis/PIP 3 | Indirect | 1-4 | ≥3 |
| Advanced physical education candidates use content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge to design and conduct appropriate learning experiences that facilitate and enhance the growth of learners. | Teaching reflects differentiation of instruction based on personal and cultural characteristics of learners | *U,P/ K,S | Curriculum Map/ PIP 2/PEP 510 | Direct | 0-60 | 48 |
| | | | Supervision Project | Direct | 0-70 | 56 |
| Advanced physical education candidates are continuous, collaborative learners who further their own professional development and use their abilities to contribute to the profession. | Conducts inquiry into professional knowledge and practice and communicates results of inquiry to the profession and community | *U,P, I/ K,S, R | Free communication or poster presentation/PIP 2/ PEP 516 | Direct | 0-48 | 38 |
| | | | Manuscript preparation and submission/ PIP 2/ PEP 571 | Direct | 0-50 | 40 |

* COE Conceptual Framework for Student Learning Outcomes: U – Understandings, P – Practices, I – Identities

* University of New Mexico Student Learning Goals: K – Knowledge, S – Skills, R – Responsibilities

Each element within the COE conceptual framework (U, P, I) aligns with the corresponding UNM student learning goal (K,S,R)

Three-year Plan – Program will continue to add (or select) a minimum of one *priority* learning goal and two associated student learning objectives each Fall semester that will be assessed in the corresponding academic year. The SLO’s will be assessed for ALL students in the program and data from the assessments entered into the electronic COE Assessment System for both Fall and Spring semesters. Program coordinators will share these data with their program faculty and faculty will discuss the results of the assessments. Finally, the faculty will consider whether the assessment methods have accurately and effectively evaluated the priority SLOs and program goals. Changes in program

procedures, instruction, and assessment may result from a discussion of results. An “Annual Program Report” on the findings and discussions of faculty will be submitted by the program to the Department Chair each year.

****PIP (Points in Program)**, – The College of Education, as part of the NCATE accreditation process, developed a “Points in Program - PIP” gateway assessment procedure for tracking students progress through the program. This tracking system has been adopted by all programs across the COE. In this system, student learning objectives are assessed at PIPS 2,3, & 4. The PIP system is described below.

PIP 1 – Admission requirements

PIP 2 – Assessments that occur during program coursework

PIP 3 – Assessments directly related to Field Experiences (student teaching, internships, etc)

PIP 4 – Program Exit assessments (licensure exams, final projects, comprehensive exams, theses/dissertation defenses, etc)

**Evaluative Rubric for Annual Progress Reports on Assessment of Student Learning
MS Physical Education – Curriculum and Instruction**

| Report Elements | Exemplary 3 | Acceptable 2 | Unacceptable 1 | Score for each Element |
|---|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| <i>Degree program student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the year</i> | SLOs were stated in terms of measurable knowledge, behavior, value, or disposition. | Not all of the SLOs were stated in measurable terms. | No SLOs were listed. | 3 |
| <i>Assessment method/measure for each SLO</i> | Two or more appropriate measures were used for each SLO. | At least one measure was used or developed for each SLO. | Measures were not used or developed or were inadequate or were not discussed. | 3 |
| <i>Direct measures (at least 1/2 of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure is to be applied to each SLO.)</i> | At least 1/2 of assessment measures were direct, and there was at least one direct measure for each SLO. | No direct measures were used during the reporting year, but direct measures are part of the plan for next year. | No direct measures were implemented or planned for the next year. | 3 |
| <i>Participants (students or alumni involved for each measure)</i> | Participants were identified for each SLO, and valid sample selection described. | Participants were identified for some SLOs, but there was some lack of clarity. | Participants were not identified. | 3 |
| <i>Timeframe in which measures were administered or data collected</i> | The timeframe for administration of measures or collection of data was specified. | The timeframe was specified for some SLOs, but not for others or there was some lack of clarity. | The timeframe was not specified. | 3 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <i>Setting/forum in which measures were administered or data collected</i> | The setting or forum in which each of the measures were administered or data collected was specified. | The setting or forum was specified for some measures, but not for all, or there was lack of clarity. | The setting or forum was not specified. | 3 |
| <i>Results</i> | Results were described for each SLO that was assessed. | Results were described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity. | Results were not described for the SLOs that were to be assessed. | 3 |
| <i>Process for data presentation to and discussion by faculty</i> | The process that was used for the interpretation, review, and discussion of the data by the faculty was described. | The process was described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity. | The process was not described. It is not clear whether the faculty considered the results of the assessment. | 3 |
| <i>Actions or revisions implemented based on assessment results</i> | Specific actions or revisions have been or will be implemented based on assessment results. | Specific actions or revisions were described but the report of or plan for implementation was unclear or incomplete in some aspects. | There were no specific actions or revisions described. | 3 |
| <i>Description of plans for the coming year (2008-09), including any significant changes to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy</i> | <i>Plans for the coming year and any significant changes in SLOs or the overall assessment strategy are clearly described.</i> | <i>Plans and any significant changes were described but in some aspects the description was unclear or incomplete.</i> | <i>There was no description of plans for the coming year nor were any significant changes in SLOs or assessment strategy described.</i> | 3 |